



ALASKAN WAY VIADUCT AND SEAWALL REPLACEMENT PROJECT COMMENT SUMMARY

December 2003

Introduction

The Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project database contains 3,592 comments, 47 of which were submitted in December 2003.

Origin of Comments

43 of the comments received came from attendees at community briefings held by the project team. Four comments were submitted on the website.

21 comments were received from the central area of the project, 12 from the southern area, and 12 from the northern area. The origin of two comments could not be determined.

Comments received at the community briefings are given during presentations by the project team. Comments and questions are recorded by a project team member and logged into the comment database.

Comment Categories

Each comment submitted is categorized by the content of the message. There are 60 comment categories divided into six sections. The sections are economic, structures/locations, involved parties, transportation, design and construction, and environmental. The comment categories range from cost and freight to traffic, air pollution and public safety.

Comments were received in the areas listed below. These are groups of similar categories with the ideas that were expressed in the comments.

Design/Construction:

This group includes categories such as construction, urban design, the seawall, and parks/green space. There were 21 comments in this group.

- Isn't the seawall a possibly larger problem than the viaduct and is the cost of replacing it included in the cost estimates for each alternative?
- Is there a preferred design for the surface and waterfront area in the tunnel alternatives?
- Has modeling been done to predict the effect of construction on downtown traffic and are there ideas being discussed, like increased metro use, as a way of alleviating the traffic?
- Is there a contractor who is included in discussions of each alternative to help estimate costs?
- Are there any plans to provide new pedestrian crossings and parking areas along the waterfront?



Traffic:

This group includes categories such as traffic, connections/circulations, pedestrians, and bicycles. There were 18 comments in this group.

- Do the traffic numbers assume further transit development like monorail and light rail?
- How does the Surface alternative work with the other arterials? Would there be improvements made to accommodate increased traffic volume?
- How do the downtown ramps perform and does removing them cause new traffic problems?
- Will pedestrian access to the waterfront and to the ferries vary significantly with each alternative?

Economic:

The group includes categories such as cost, funding, property value/acquisition, and tolls. There were 17 comments in this group.

- The Tunnel alternative seems to be the most popular among property owners in the area, would taxing property owners that would benefit from replacing the viaduct be a funding option?
- How will local funding for the project be generated?
- What role will federal funds play a part in the total funding?
- The importance of the viaduct to freight is a message that should be delivered to more of the population.

Project Related:

This group includes categories like purpose and need, public involvement, or anything related to City of Seattle, WSDOT, or FHWA. There were six comments in this group.

- How is a preferred alternative chosen and who chooses it?
- Are other projects such as the Embarcadero in San Francisco being studied for the viaduct project?

Transit:

This group includes categories like light rail, monorail, and transit. There were five comments in this group.

- Are transit improvements such as monorail and light rail included in the traffic information?
- Has the addition of an HOV lane on the viaduct been studied?

Environmental/Public Safety:

This group includes categories like soils, public safety, earthquakes, and fish/wildlife. There were four comments in this group.

- What are the soil conditions around the viaduct and seawall?
- Would all the alternatives be built to the same earthquake standards?